

## KANAKAS JUBILANT.

EFFECT UPON HAWAIIAN NATIVES OF THE COMING OF THE COMMISSIONER.

THE ARRIVAL OF THE UNITED STATES STEAMER RUSH GREETED WITH ENTHUSIASM—SENATOR BLOUNT REFUSES TO INDICATE HIS PLANS—POLYNESIAN COURTESY FOR THE AMERICAN OFFICIAL VISITORS.

Honolulu, March 29.—The United States steamer *Rush*, Captain C. L. Hooper commanding, arrived at 10 o'clock this morning, eight days and twenty hours from San Francisco, with Special Commissioner James H. Blount, of Georgia, on board. The news of the possibility of President Cleveland sending a commission to investigate the state of affairs here reached Honolulu by the steamer which sailed from San Francisco on March 17, and since then expectation has been on high awaiting the event.

When the *Rush* was sighted off Diamond Head at 8 o'clock the shore signal station immediately ran up a signal denoting the nature of the ship. Upon receiving the answer the *Rush* was hailed by the harbor authorities, and the *Rush* proceeded to the city. Upon her arrival the harbor residents and consular officials were decorating their houses with the Stars and Stripes, and soon from every available pole and tower "Old Glory" fluttered to the breeze.

Crowds of natives and members of the different political parties thronged to the wharves and occupied every available point from which a view of the incoming vessel was afforded, and as she stemmed up and took her place between the Boston and the Japanese warship *Naniwa-Ken* cheer upon cheer was given, and hundreds of small American flags were waved in welcome.

Boarding officers from the different war ships visited the *Rush*, tendering the usual courtesies of the port to the visiting ship. Minister Stevens in the *Mahealani* was the first visitor to reach the *Rush*, and was immediately escorted to the Commissioner. Next to come was Mr. Robertson, the Chamberlain of the ex-Queen. The newspaper correspondents boarded the *Rush* just as soon as the official courtesies had been exchanged. Great surprise was expressed that only one Commissioner had come down to investigate the great question. Admiral Brown and General Schofield having been mentioned as probable members of the board. Their friends here were greatly disappointed.

Matters in the islands are at present quiet, but there is a growing feeling of unrest which may culminate at any moment in a serious disturbance of the peace. The influential portion of the population, the respectable, taxpaying business community and the better class of natives are earnestly in favor of annexation, with the assurance of a strong Government. When it became known that Cleveland had withdrawn the treaty proposed by Harrison public opinion received a decided setback. The feeling of elation so noticeable before the news came gave way to one of despondency on the part of the leaders which soon communicated itself to the impressionable masses.

Business has been very dull, and unless it is speedily shown that the Administration favors a continuation of the Hawaiian policy, a serious crisis in affairs throughout the islands.

It is impossible to give an approximate idea of what Mr. Blount will do in his capacity of representative of President Cleveland. The Commissioner, when seen by your correspondent this morning, expressed himself as not being ready to talk about Hawaiian affairs. "In fact," said Mr. Blount, "this so-called isn't what it cracked up to be, and after nine days of the kind of shaking up that I have just experienced I don't feel like talking about anything."

Mr. Blount smiled and said that he had decided that it was his plan to be seen by the natives and to be drawn out of his shell. Secretary Mills was found very busy, and his mind seemed an absolute blank on the subject of the character of the mission or the future action of his chief. One of the officers of the *Rush* gave "The Chronicle" correspondent a short resume of the trip. "We left San Francisco at 1 o'clock Monday," he said, "and crossed the bar about 5 p. m. Head winds and a heavy head sea were encountered immediately after getting to sea, and lasted two days. Our passengers were sick, and of course, complained so little, and gave so little trouble, that they seemed everybody's sympathy. Mr. Blount suffered especially, as during rough weather she was compelled to remain below. We reached here, however, in good trim, having made the passage in less than nine days, which is good time for a vessel as small as the *Rush*. Nothing of interest occurred during the trip, and the first excitement was the sight of the island this morning."

"No, I can't tell you what Mr. Blount thinks of annexation. I don't believe he has mentioned the subject since he has been on board, but if I were going to make a guess, and what you are only a guess, I would say that he would not make a report favorable to annexation until the matter has been thoroughly investigated, and until the voice of the people, the natives, I mean, is heard."

"I think you had better go on the supposition that a strong pro-annexation will result from the present visit of the Commissioner rather than absolute annexation. But, of course, you know best what the state of affairs is ashore, and the chance of annexation by the direct request or vote of the people."

From other sources it was learned that it is the present intention of the Commissioner to visit the several settlements in the other islands on the coast. The *Rush* is expected to return after a week's stay here, as her services will be no longer required. These arrangements may be changed later, as it is just possible that affairs may so shape themselves as to require the presence of the *Rush* at Honolulu, or it may be deemed inexpedient to send so large a ship among the islands, and in that case the Commissioner has power to hold the *Rush* subject to his orders.

A flurry of excitement was caused here last night by the escape of a Japanese prisoner charged with murder from the custody of the provisional Government and his reception on board the Japanese warship *Naniwa-Ken* as a refugee. The prisoner swam off to the warship and was allowed to go on board. When his whereabouts became known the authorities of the provisional Government, who had been raised in the United States by the return, but this application was refused by the Japanese officers.

This affair has caused various rumors to become current as to the intention of the Japanese Government to have a hand in the game of annexation which is being played with the islands for a stake. It would be indeed rather startling if, while the United States is hesitating, Japan should step in and secure the prize. The ultra-English party here is intensely opposed to America, and would hesitate at nothing to prevent American control of the islands. The English Government evidently intends to let the United States severely alone in this matter, and has not given any official encouragement to the members of the English party under the leadership of Davies & Co., hence it is whispered that this party has joined issue with the Japanese in the islands, and expects through this union to perfect its plans for preventing American annexation.

The Japanese scare began in some wild talk of Consul-General Fugii, and in the rumor that the *Naniwa* had a cargo of rifles on board with which she intended to arm the contract laborers. The visit of the *Kongo* to Hilo was also made the

pretext for absurd stories, some of which, even at this late day, are in process of exploitation abroad. While it is true, no doubt, that the Japanese covet these islands and would seize them with the approval of the English, if the Americans were in the way, it is more sensationalism to state that Japan has any present designs upon them or that the Japanese officials here are stirring rebellious blood among the laboring or native classes, or that the presence of the *Naniwa* here is a coercive measure against the interests of the Provisional Government.

During the week since the *Australian's* arrival the royalist propaganda has been very active. The Cummins League had several meetings, at which it was decided to make the visit of the United States Commissioner one long round of festivity. Mr. Cummins, in an enthusiastic speech, said that he had private assurances from both General Schofield and Admiral Brown that the cause of home rule would not suffer at their hands, and in view of this he proposed that the funds of the league be freely used to make their trip enjoyable. The members of the organization agreed to this, and already the scent of the coming banquet hangs in the air. It is quite evident that if the commissioner makes good use of his opportunities he will go home disintegrated with food and in condition to report in *vinum veritas* upon the cause of the oppressed Kanaka.

Not to be outdone by the men, the women of the Polynesian race intend to offer the commissioner a hoopla. This form of entertainment may be compared to the New-England pound party, except that the weight of the presents is not at all circumscribed. Two years ago, when Admiral Brown was here, the hoopla was tried upon him with great success. Native women from far and near boarded his ship and laid their offerings at his feet. Some brought native pigs and other chickens, some brought native goods, and some brought native goods. The sailors lived on pork and poultry for a fortnight and had five meals a day. Besides the live stock the women proffered crabs, snails, headbaskets, headbands, Mother Hubbard's, and other goods, and the Admiral accepted the whole consignment with becomingunction. To this day the natives believe that but for the hoopla the Americans would never have let the Queen come to the throne; and so, to try the device again in this hour of dire emergency seems the fitting thing to do.

The statement of Hawaii, although disappointed at the withdrawal of the treaty, are not depressed at the outlook for annexation. They think the commissioner will find, when he studies the problems presented here, that the best interests of both Hawaii and the United States require that the islands shall come into the American republic, either as a State or in a territorial relation.

On the night of March 21 the annexationists showed their numbers and proclaimed their views in a mass meeting at the provisional armory. The large building was packed with white and native citizens, and enthusiasm was without limit over what was believed to be the assurance that union with America had been, or would soon be, reached. T. F. Lansing, a well-known Honolulu citizen, opened the meeting and made a brief address, in which he said that a club would be formed to support the Provisional Government and to assist the annexation policy. E. M. Hatch, of the Advisory Council, was made chairman, and J. W. Jones, secretary. The foremost men in politics here, including Robert W. Wilcox, and J. Joseph, leaders of native blood, and William C. Wilcox, A. S. Hartwell, Dr. J. S. McGrew, Professor Scott, H. N. Castle, John Emery, Hugh Gann, Alexander Young and Professor Olson, prominent white citizens, were heard in strong addresses.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

The meeting was a reflection in advance of the good news which it was hoped the Oceanic liner *Australian* might bring in. Fortunate that the *Australian* had been delayed, and that of repairing could be broken. Had it waited another twenty-four hours the spirit of the rally would have lacked its saving grace of confidence.

store, and also owned large farms. He borrowed large sums of money from the Whiteville banks in late years, on which finally he could not pay interest. So the banks had his belongings transferred to a company and are running them to pay his debts. For if sold at auction they would bring little or nothing. White also had large sums of money loaned to him without security by farmers in the neighborhood. The general creditors will not get five cents on the dollar. The book accounts of slow-paying farmers are valued at \$100,000, of which \$100,000 cannot be realized. Many of them are barred by the statute of limitation. W. H. Wallace, Sr., is said to be the oldest postmaster in the United States.

## SUPREME COURT DECISIONS.

## NO REHEARING OF THE LAKE-FRONT CASE.

## MANDATES TO BE GRANTED BY THE SUPREME COURT—A RULING ON PERSONAL BAGGAGE.

Washington, April 10.—The Supreme Court today, by Justice Field, delivered its decision upon the latest moves in the Chicago lake-front case, which settled them as far as the court is concerned. Justice Field announced that the petition of the Corporation Counsel, Miller, for the issue of mandamus to execute writs of *habeas corpus* and *habeas ad testandum* issued, this disposition of the second petition by the counsel for the railroad company presented last week for a rehearing of the case by the court. None of the attorneys for the Illinois Central were in court today.

One of the decisions of Judge Gresham, while upon the bench of the Circuit Court for the seventh circuit, was before the Supreme Court today on appeal, and the court reversed his finding. A member of the firm of Perry Brothers, manufacturing jewelers, of Chicago, travelled, as agent of the firm, over the Wabash, St. Louis and Pacific Railroad, with a trunk containing his samples, valued at about \$10,000. It was checked as "personal baggage," neither Perry nor the railroad agent asking any questions, nor making any statement. As to the contents of the trunk, which was alleged to be what was commonly known as a jeweler's trunk. The trunk jumped the track, and the baggage-carrier, with its contents, was destroyed by fire. Perry Brothers sued the receivers of the company for their loss and a master awarded them \$7,257. On review by Judge Gresham, the finding of the court was reversed, and the case was remanded to the Circuit Court for a new trial. Justice Field, in announcing the decision reversing this finding, said that it was reached on the grounds that there was no evidence to show that the baggage-carrier had any actual knowledge of the contents of the trunk, and that Perry in purchasing a ticket for a passenger train, and then transferring his trunk to the baggage-carrier, was entitled to the protection of the railroad company. The receivers were not liable for the contents of the trunk other than "personal baggage."

The following business was also done: No. 157, James M. Grant, appellant, vs. Richard W. Deane, defendant. Decree reversed with costs and a new trial. No. 161, George Krenzel, appellant, vs. the S. C. C. Co. Decree reversed with costs and a new trial. No. 140, The United States, appellant, vs. the Union Pacific Railway Company et al. Decree affirmed.

No. 148, The Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Chicago. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 129, The Pittsburg, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of St. Louis. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 130, The Indianapolis and Vincennes Railroad Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Indianapolis. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 131, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 132, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 133, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 134, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 135, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 136, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 137, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 138, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 139, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 140, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 141, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 142, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 143, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 144, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 145, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 146, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 147, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 148, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 149, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 150, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 151, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 152, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 153, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 154, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 155, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 156, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 157, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 158, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 159, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 160, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 161, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 162, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 163, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 164, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 165, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 166, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 167, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 168, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 169, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 170, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 171, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 172, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 173, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 174, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 175, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 176, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 177, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 178, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 179, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 180, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 181, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 182, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 183, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 184, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 185, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 186, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 187, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 188, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 189, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 190, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 191, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 192, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 193, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 194, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 195, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 196, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 197, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 198, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 199, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 200, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 201, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 202, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 203, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 204, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 205, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 206, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 207, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 208, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 209, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 210, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 211, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 212, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 213, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 214, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 215, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 216, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 217, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 218, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 219, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 220, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 221, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 222, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 223, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 224, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 225, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 226, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 227, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 228, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 229, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 230, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 231, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 232, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 233, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 234, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 235, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 236, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 237, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 238, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 239, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 240, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 241, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 242, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 243, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 244, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 245, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 246, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 247, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 248, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 249, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 250, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 251, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 252, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 253, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 254, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 255, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 256, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 257, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 258, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 259, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 260, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 261, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 262, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 263, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 264, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 265, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 266, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 267, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 268, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 269, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 270, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 271, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 272, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 273, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 274, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 275, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 276, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 277, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 278, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 279, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 280, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 281, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 282, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 283, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 284, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 285, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 286, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 287, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 288, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 289, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 290, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 291, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 292, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 293, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 294, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 295, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 296, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 297, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 298, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 299, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 300, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 301, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 302, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 303, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 304, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 305, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 306, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 307, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 308, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 309, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 310, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 311, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 312, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 313, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 314, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 315, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 316, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 317, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 318, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 319, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 320, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 321, The Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, plaintiff in error, vs. the City of Cleveland. Motion to dismiss, affirmed. No. 322, The Cleveland